## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

LAWRENCE CHRISTOPHER REDDING,

Plaintiff, No. 03:10-cv-00998-PK

v.

DR. J. DHALIWAL, et al.,

Defendants. ORDER

HERNANDEZ, District Judge:

Magistrate Judge Papak issued a Findings & Recommendation (#263) on September 10, 2013, in which he recommends the Court grant Defendants' motion for summary judgment.

Plaintiff has timely filed objections to the Findings & Recommendation. The matter is now before me pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b).

When any party objects to any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Findings & Recommendation, the district court must make a *de novo* determination of that portion of the Magistrate Judge's report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); <u>Dawson v. Marshall</u>, 561 F.3d 930, 932 (9th Cir. 2009); United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc).

I have carefully considered Plaintiff's objections and conclude there is no basis to modify the Findings & Recommendation. I have also reviewed the pertinent portions of the record *de novo* and find no other errors in the Magistrate Judge's Findings & Recommendation.

## CONCLUSION

The Court ADOPTS Magistrate Judge Papak's Findings & Recommendation [#263], and therefore, Defendants' motion for summary judgment [#220] is granted.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

TED this O day of

United States District Judge

2 - ORDER